



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/202,783	05/24/1999	HANS-JURGEN FISCHER	10191/913	3361

26646 7590 06/17/2003

KENYON & KENYON  
ONE BROADWAY  
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

WASYLCHAK, STEVEN R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3624

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/202,783

Applicant(s)

FISCHER ET AL.

Examiner

Steven R. Wasylchak

Art Unit

3624

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 03 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 8-17.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-7.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The essence of applicant's argument is found on page 4 of applicant's Response After Final:

- before an interrupt-sensitive time period, transmitting a first data word of the at least one data word from the storage device to the terminal, the first data word being generated for the mutual dynamic authenticity test;
- during the interrupt-sensitive time period, transmitting a particular signal from the terminal to the storage device, the particular signal including a posting triggering signal, a posting data record, an identifier generated using the first data word and a second data word of the at least one data word generated by one of the computer and the terminal;
- generating, by the storage device, a further identifier as a function of the second data word.

Applicant is directed to the final Office Action of Response to Arguments on 4 March 2003, pages 3-5, where an element by element accounting has been made for claim limitations including those which applicant has identified as points 1-3 in his Response After Final Rejection. In addition, before an interrupt-sensitive time period as it relates to the argument above, an inherent, explicit "handshake" is attempted between the respective transmitter storage and receiver terminal elements. During the "interrupt-sensitive" phase, an inherent explicit "handshake" is acknowledged between the terminal and storage elements, the usual data is transferred, and an identifier for both elements is established as well as a communication link based upon a dataword between the computer and terminal. The last stage of generating, by the storage device, a further identifier is inherently necessary to complete the communication loop and establish some correlation between all three elements of storage, terminal and the computer and is based upon an inherent composite function (here a function of another function or an operator function operating on another function); in this case the function identifiers are based upon domain data words inherent in any information communication system. Again, examiner finds bi-directionality for "handshaking" and data transfer for claim 8, between the RCS and the IUV in Chaum (US 5,485,520): fig 1(22) and col 7, L12-17, 37-65. Arguments advanced outside of what has been recited in the claims are deemed arguments applicant is arguing other than what has been recited in claims in the Response After Final and the response will be entered for purposes of appeal only.



DR. GEOFFREY R. AKERS, P.E.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER